



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,142	01/25/2006	Peter Von Zimmermann	07781.0229-00	2084
60668	7590	10/26/2010	EXAMINER	
SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			KANERVO, VIRPI H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3691			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/26/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/529,142	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VON ZIMMERMANN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> VIRPI H. KANERVO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-68)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of the Claims***

1. Claims 1-11 and 17-26 are presented for examination. Applicant filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) on 06/16/2010 amending independent claims 1, 11, and 26. Examiner has established a new § 101 rejection for claims 11 and 17-25 in the instant Office action. In light of Applicant's amendments, Examiner withdraws the previous grounds of the § 103 rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26. New grounds of § 103 rejection, however, are established for the claims 1-11 and 17-26 in the instant Office action.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's arguments directed to the § 103 rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26, but they are moot in view of new grounds of § 103 rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 11 and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 11 and 17-25 are directed to a system. There are, however, no system components in the body of the claim, but only software because the system comprises multiple modules that specification shows being "program modules." Software has no structure, *i.e.*, software alone is *per se* non-statutory subject matter. Applicant could, *e.g.*, amend independent claim 11 to include memory coupled with processor executing the different elements of the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in § 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-11 and 17-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nip (2003/0212682 A1) in view of Musmanno (5,940,809), further in view of Tenner (2003/00225742 A1), and further in view of Doughty (7,363,264 B1).

As to claims 1, 11, and 26, Nip shows producing, using a processor, at least one input data (Nip: page 2, ¶ 22) and storing, in a storage device, the output data with an identification code (Nip: page 2, ¶ 27).

Nip does not show the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications by referring to the identification code. Musmanno shows the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 11-13) and to one or more business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 25-27); transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 27-28); and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13) by referring to the identification code (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record

into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications by referring to the identification code of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

Nip in view of Musmanno does not show the output data record having a first data area and a first identification code, and the output data record also having a second data area and a second identification code, wherein the output data record can be read in full or in part by referring to the first identification code or the second identification code. Tennen shows the output data record having a first data area and a first identification code, and the output data record also having a second data area and a second identification code, wherein the output data record can be read in full or in part by referring to the first identification code or the second identification code (Tennen: page 6, ¶¶ 65-66; and page 7, ¶ 71). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Musmanno by the output data record having a first data area and a first identification code, and the output data record also having a second data area and a second identification code, wherein the output data record can be read in full or in part by referring to the first identification code or the second identification

code of Tenner in order to create a data warehouse mapping data structure to correlate at least two different data sources (Tenner: page 2, ¶ 19).

Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Tenner, does not show a first data area and a second data area, wherein the first data area is configured to be read by a first of the business applications, and the second data area is configured to be read by a second of the business applications. Doughty shows a first data area and a second data area, wherein the first data area is configured to be read by a first of the business applications, and the second data area is configured to be read by a second of the business applications (Doughty: col. 1, lines 22-63; col. 11, lines 45-67; and col. 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Tenner, by a first data area and a second data area, wherein the first data area is configured to be read by a first of the business applications, and the second data area is configured to be read by a second of the business applications of Doughty in order to store, manage and retrieve data for a variety of applications (Doughty: col. 1, lines 33-34).

As to claims 2 and 17, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed

using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module. Musmanno shows that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module (Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the producing step being performed using a first program module, the transforming step being performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 3 and 18, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the business application is in the form of a third or further program module. Musmanno shows that the business application is in the form of a third or further program module

(Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the business application being in the form of a third or further program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 4 and 19, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 3 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface. Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 16-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the second program module being in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data

processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 5 and 20, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 3 and 19. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display. Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the second program module being in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for

managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 6 and 21, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 5 and 20. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the selectable data can be selected by the third program module. Musmanno shows that the selectable data can be selected by the third program module (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the selectable capable of being selected by the third program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 7 and 22, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the output data record is stored on a transactional basis. Musmanno shows that the output data record is stored on a transactional basis (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view

of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the output data record being stored on a transactional basis of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 8 and 23, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 6-8 and 52-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the output data record including, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 9 and 24, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the output data

record includes, for different journals in accounting, different data areas. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting, different data areas (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 56-67; and col. 6, lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the output data record including, for different journals in accounting, different data areas of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 10 and 25, Nip in view of Musmanno, further in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, does not show that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business applications. Musmanno shows that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Tenner, and further in view of Doughty, by the output data record being designed for access via at least two business applications of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nitahara (6,604,108 B1) discloses information mart system and information mart browser.

Bonalle (7,119,659 B2) discloses systems and methods for providing a RF transaction device for use in a private label transaction.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIRPI H. KANERVO whose telephone number is 571-272-9818. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Virpi H. Kanervo

/Alexander Kalinowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691